

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/547,661	ROWSE ET AL.
	Examiner Jonathan Ouellette	Art Unit 3629

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jonathan Ouellette. (3)_____.

(2) John Laroy. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 28 October 2002.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference

c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-6, 16-18, and 28-29.

Identification of prior art discussed: DiRienzo et al (US 6,076,066).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Laroy and Examiner Ouellette discussed some details included in Independent Claims 1-6, 16-18, and 28-29, that Mr. Laroy believed were not shown in the prior art (DiRienzo et al.) - specifically where the "digital information is automatically downloaded from the camera when the camera is returned to the service station." Mr. Laroy and Examiner Ouellette discussed how the claims could be amended to show greater detail about the downloading step, to further increase the chances of patentability.

Mr. Laroy and Examiner Ouellette also discussed the possibility of incorporating additional details from the specification into the claims to further increase the probability of patentability - including: warrenty returns wording, mobility detail, real-time processing specifics, and automotive value chain specifics.